

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
THE DIRECTOR OF INTELLIGENCE AND RESEARCH
WASHINGTON

State Dept. declassification & release instructions on file

MEMORANDUM

To: O/OM - Mr. Thomas Stern

From: INR - Ray S. Cline

Subject: Review of Your Action Memorandum and Staff Study
on the Geographic Attaché Program

BACKGROUND

The Bureau of Intelligence and Research, INR, has been conducting a coordinated map procurement and reporting program for twenty-three years, serving the requirements of the Department of State, the intelligence agencies, the Department of Defense, and several non-military organizations within the federal government. This program has received high praise from all participants and has satisfactorily performed a service essential to all agencies in the Inter-Agency Map and Publications Acquisitions Committee.

Mr. Howard Mace, who was intimately associated with this program in Japan, where a Geographic Attaché was assigned to his office, and in Europe, where he inspected several posts where Geographic Attachés were assigned, once spoke to the Inter-Agency Map and Publications Acquisitions Committee, and told that group that the Geographic Attaché program was one of the most efficient, best-managed and backstopped programs in the Foreign Service. The program functions today in the same manner, but with fewer people, due to BALPA and OPRED.

It is this program which is currently being studied by your office.

O/OM RECOMMENDATIONS

You have requested INR comments on the following recommendation:

- "1. That you request a review of the intelligence requirements of the map procurement program by USIB or NIRB to determine present needs and collection priorities.

Approve X

Disapprove "

INR believes that this is the appropriate manner to resolve the question that seems to exist in O/OM with respect to the Departmental conduct of this program. Consequently, INR concurs in the proposal that this matter be submitted to the USIB or NIRB for resolution.

Your second recommendation to Mr. Macomber, Jr., involves the complete dismantling of this effective, coordinated map procurement and reporting program, which has served the needs of the Department, and intelligence and mapping components of all areas of the federal government for 23 years. INR cannot concur in this proposal and so records its disapproval of the recommendation.

INR RECOMMENDATION

INR strongly urges that the matter be placed before the USIB or NIRB, as stated in your first recommendation, and that the procurement and reporting program continue as it is presently constituted until the review is completed.

Any attempt to implement your second recommendation before a consideration of the findings of the USIB or NIRB would not seem to constitute a logical management process, in that decisions would be made before the case would have been reviewed and the findings examined.

CLARIFICATIONS

1. Your recommendations and staff study indicate that the Department of State spends \$260,000 on this program. It does not present in easily identifiable fashion the relationship of that figure to the input of other agencies. Those figures are presented below:

Total Annual Cost of Map Program	--	\$579,507
Total Annual Cost to the Department of State	--	\$252,949
Total Annual Cost to Other Agencies	--	\$326,558

(Information from Item II D of your Management Study)

The military, intelligence and civilian agencies participating in the Inter-Agency Map Procurement Program are thus paying 57% of the total bill at the present time. This seems to be a substantial contribution to a function for which the Department of State is responsible.

2. Your II F 1 states "Since the principal beneficiaries are Defense and CIA, should State (a minor beneficiary) provide both the locationally cover and a major part of the funding and other resources?"

It should be clearly understood that the Department of State:

- a. receives 58,000 maps annually and is not a minor beneficiary (the other agencies receive 80,000 maps among them. (Information from your II E 1 and 2.)
- b. contributes 43% of the funding of the entire program, and receives other agency support for the remaining 57%.

3. INR believes that the conclusions and recommendations reached, on the basis of the management study, are not consistent with the facts as presented in the study. In addition, no concrete proposals for any alternative solution to the problem of map procurement are offered which guarantee that the U. S. government will receive the most effective and economical program possible.